

REMARKS

Objection to Specification

The specification is objected to because the “second sensor 122” is not shown in the drawings. The applicant’s copy of the drawings show a second sensor 122. However, the use of a second sensor is readily apparent to those of ordinary skill in the art upon reading the disclosure, as stated in page 4 lines 7-13. The addition of a second sensor, is not necessary for the understanding of the invention as it is described in sufficient detail in the specification. Thus, if, indeed, the second sensor 122 is not shown in figure 1, then the Applicant respectfully request for the Examiner to indicate the preference of either deleting “122” from the specification, or either including the second sensor to figure 1, the inclusion being supported by the specification.

Rejections Under 35 USC §112

The Examiner rejects claim 5 as being indefinite. Claim 5 has been amended to more clearly state the claim. Thus addressed, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejections to claims under 35 USC 112.

Rejections Under 35 USC §102 & 35 USC §103


The independent claims are currently amended. Specifically, the claims more clearly define the invention as providing the indication of the child lock status when the door is open as supported in the specification on page 6, lines 10-15. In addition, various elements are more fully defined to distinguish the invention from the cited art. The Examiner correctly points out in the Office Action that Kobayashi does not disclose an indicator coupled to a sensor. Further, the indicators that the Examiner refers to in both Kobayashi and Bodley-Scott indicate that status of the door locks, not the child locks. Thus, the Applicant believes that the invention has been defined in a non-obvious manner over the prior art, and the Examiner is respectfully requested to allow the claims.

In the Event Arguments are Believed Insufficient

The Examiner is thanked for the consideration. Should the Examiner disagree that the remarks place the application in condition for allowance, then the Examiner is respectfully requested to prepare an acceptable proposed set of claims pursuant to MPEP 707.07 (j).

If the Examiner has other matters which remain, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the under signed attorney to resolve these matters by Examiners Amendment where possible.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Steven W. Thrasher", written in a cursive style.

Steven W. Thrasher, Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 43,192

Thrasher Associates, LLC
391 Sandhill Dr., Suite 1600
Richardson, Texas 75080
Tel: (972) 918-9312
Fax: (214) 291-5991